

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are currently pending, with claims 1 and 6 being in independent form. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §10b(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,193,641 (“*Durrell*”). Claim 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Durrell*. For the following reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1 and 6 recite “said on-off control circuit being configured to start the fuel pump arrangement at an attempted starting of the motor vehicle and being triggered to switch off the fuel pump...”. *Durrell* fails to teach or suggest this limitation.

The Examiner (pg. 2 of the Office Action) asserts that:

Durrell discloses ... a detection circuit (10) (i.e., fuel lock unit) detecting an unauthorized system activation, and an on-off control circuit pertaining to and controlling a fuel pump arrangement functionality means, said on-off control circuit being configured to start the fuel pump arrangement at an attempted starting of the motor vehicle and being triggered to switch off the fuel pump after the attempted starting when said detection circuit detects that the attempted starting was unauthorized (see col. 2 lines 41-54, see Abstract)

Applicants disagree.

Durrell relates to an anti-theft system and method for automobiles that cuts off the fuel supply from a gas tank when the automobile is improperly started (see Abstract). According to *Durrell*, “the connection between fuel tank 11 and fuel pump line 12 is made by closing a vacuum controlled poppet valve 23 which is springloaded in the normally open position by spring 24 but which is actuated to close or enable the fuel line by the enabling of the vacuum in

the vacuum line 14” (see col. 2, lines 41-46). *Durrell* thus teaches a system in which the fuel line is actually broken or severed. There is nothing in *Durrell* to teach or suggest that the fuel pump itself is disabled by an on-off control circuit. Simply because the fuel line is broken, it does not mean that the fuel pump has been rendered non-operational. An unauthorized user could still provide fuel to the pump via an alternate source and, thus, continue to operate the vehicle because the fuel pump of *Durrell* will still work if simply provided with fuel.

Moreover, *Durrell* (col. 2, lines 1-3 FIG. 1) teaches that two units along with their linking vacuum and fiber optic lines are placed in a standard automobile. *Durrell* (col. 2, lines 3-6) explains that “[a] fuel lock unit would be installed on a gas or fuel tank 11 (in the automobile) and interposed in the existing fuel line 12 which goes to the fuel pump in the engine compartment. *Durrell* (col. 2, lines 3-6) additionally explains that “[t]he second unit, the ignition switch unit 13, either can replace the steering column lock in original equipment applications, or alternatively, be connected in series with the existing steering column lock on retrofit applications”. *Durrell* thus teaches that the complete deactivation of the fuel pump in the system of *Durrell* can only be achieved by the use of the fuel lock unit 10 and the ignition switch unit 13 shown in Fig. 1.

The claimed invention, in contrast, is directed to a system that blocks operation of the fuel pump to prevent the vehicle from being driven away. This is accomplished by specifically deactivating the fuel pump of the vehicle. Thus, even if another source of fuel were provided to applicants’ claimed fuel pump, an unauthorized user could not operate the vehicle with such a pump because the fuel pump would still be inoperable. *Durrell* thus fails to teach or suggest a system that would encompass such an advantageous feature, since there is no teaching or

suggestion in *Durrell* that the fuel pump itself is deactivated by an on-off control circuit that falls within the meaning and scope of applicants' claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over *Durrell*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) are in order, and a notice to that effect is requested.

Dependent claims 2-5 are also patentable for at least the same reasons as is independent claims 1 and 6, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

Based on the foregoing remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, suggestions, or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to facilitate reaching a resolution of any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Alfred W. Froebrich/
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: August 12, 2008